

6/16/70

Dear Steve Blostin,

I hope you also understand that the amount of work I have undertaken is in itself enough to prevent my taking the time for diplomacy in my letters. I mean nothing personal unless it is direct and obvious. When I intend to be insulting there is no doubt of it. Otherwise, I have no such intent.

The books will go out today, with this letter enclosed or separately, sent special handling, which should go like first class.

With the list of book you cite I see nothing to change the appraisal I gave you. Lane is inclined to slipperiness and shaving it a bit. Thompson is a persuasive crook who has added incorrect conjecture to the work of others, often, as you will realize in your reading, not cited as the published work of others. I think, for example, there is no exception to this: when he says "according to documents recently discovered at the National Archives," of some such formulation, the real source is WHITEWASH II. There is the possibility of extracting some information from Bishop, but I doubt if your knowledge will develop to the point you can by the time you write, for he is often just plain wrong when he seems to be quoting, even in the interviews he says he had, if the others, to whom I have spoken, tell the truth. I encourage you to ignore the others.

There is seemingly persuasive writing on the other side that is dishonest in concept as it is in content. Even when there are quotation marks they are not to be depended upon. Example, Scavengers. Roberts is deliberately tricky, as if the lengthy AP series. In short, I know of no single dependable work on the other side, in any form or format.

Your reference to the selection of an exact topic seems inconsistent with what you first wrote, but it may not be. I think it wise to select a single aspect for a book at this juncture. When you are in a position to do this, perhaps I can help.

Good Luck,

Harold Weisberg